



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the meantime the misunderstanding on the other side was becoming deeper and graver. Either for the purpose of local politics, or to give vent to racial feelings, or to facilitate more imperialistic expansion of the navy, or in anticipation of keen economic rivalry, Japan's "black intentions" on the Pacific coast of this country or of Canada, on the Sandwich Islands, on the Philippines, on Australia, on Korea, on Manchuria, on China herself, were freely aired by sensation-mongers. Our unquestioning confidence in the willingness and ability on the part of the United States to grant us whatever was right and just — this confidence was not accompanied by a clear understanding of your internal politics on the one hand, and, on the other, by a full cognizance of the fact that Japan's rise in power was causing uneasiness, alarm, suspicion and fear even among friendly nations. At last we awoke to this unpleasant truth.

A grown-up person cannot expect the same tender care that he enjoyed in his childhood, but is he not entitled to unchanging friendship if he is good?

Gradually, however, mental readjustment to the new balance of power has been made. Clouds of suspicion and alarm were swept away from one point after another. Japan has learned the morbidly nervous condition of international sensibility.

I wish there was an international court of libel as well as a permanent tribunal for universal arbitration. Time heals, it is true, but in some cases time only confirms the disease.

Rivalry in business of one's own son or pupil must be extremely unpleasant. The son or pupil would fain avoid such rivalry if there were other openings.

Some would be proud to say that Japan has sobered down and come to her senses, but she believes that she has obtained justice at last.

To relieve the congestion of Europe has been to America's interest as well. To contribute to the peace and prosperity of this country should be the aim of all immigrants, both Oriental and Occidental.

Where the Koreans and Japanese were largely mixed together after Taiko's expedition, the two peoples lived on better terms than in any other parts of the peninsula. In European Russia, where Asiatics once subjugated Europeans, both races still retain mutual respect. The same result accruing from propinquity can only be secured now through community of interest, not by conquest or invasion.

All the violent storm of false accusation was nothing but the entrance fee, the initiation ceremony, for the East for its admittance into the World School.

American criticism of our dealings with China is only an aftermath of the "Japanese situation," in so far as the weapon of misrepresentation and sheer falsehood is employed. Our commercial rivalry is the sole and real cause of the trouble, and that kind of warfare can be conducted in a way perfectly fair and square. A frank and sympathetic acknowledgment, on either side, of certain unalterable facts will surely help mutual understanding.

One of these facts is the great anomaly of Japan's position in Manchuria. We fought for the territorial integrity of and equal opportunity in China. Then we inherited and shared in privileges and concessions inconsistent with China's full exercise of sovereignty. What

was accomplished in darkness and mystery, we have succeeded to in the broad daylight of the public gaze.

China's rise in national consciousness and the existing conditions of her internal politics demand strenuous efforts in the recovery of her rights. Japan, being the newest intruder and a novice in diplomacy, is the best antagonist for China to try her rejuvenated strength upon.

Both settled policy and national interest prompt the United States to make sure of equal opportunity in China. Where claims of justice and interest support each other, even a lawful acquisition by others is apt to be interpreted as infringement, and unavoidable competition looks like wilful opposition.

"American diplomacy," popularly so-called, direct, straightforward, fearless and independent, cannot be adopted by other nations at the present stage of human progress. There are a great many eventualities for which we must be ready, but of which we cannot explain details. If we explain, we may wrong one party; if we do not explain, we are suspected by all.

Neither this country nor Japan can extend her market anywhere better than in China, and both urgently need commercial expansion. There ought to be what I call "international socialism," by which the capital of one nation and the labor of another can be combined to mutual advantage.

For the welfare of mankind, some peoples, in the long run, must learn the beauty of a simpler life, whereas others are in need of being taught the blessing of a higher standard of comfort. Before a harmony in diversity is reached among nations and races, between the East and the West, there will always be heard the sound of ripples and waves on the sea of humanity.

Armaments and Their Results.*

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Armies and navies exist and increase solely under the plea that these are the best, and indeed the only means of ensuring peace.

We deal with three of the axioms urged in their justification.

First: "To be prepared for war is the surest way to secure peace."

Answer: If only one nation "prepared" this axiom would be sound; but when one arms others follow, and the fancied security vanishes. Rivalry between nations ensues, and preparation, so far from promoting peace, sows suspicion and jealousy, developing into hatred the prolific seed of future wars between nations hitherto peacefully disposed.

Nations are only aggregations of men, and all human experience proves that men unarmed are less likely to quarrel than men armed. Hence in civilized lands they are debarred from arming.

Two neighbors have a difference which a friendly interview would have solved, but one acts upon the

* Issued in pamphlet by the Peace Society, 47 New Broad Street, London, E. C.

axiom, "In time of peace prepare for war," and buys a pistol. Hearing this, the other promptly "prepares."

The first decides he is insufficiently "prepared," and buys a six-chambered revolver, an action that is immediately followed by his neighbor. With every additional weapon purchased the premium upon their lives would be promptly raised by insurance companies. These "prepared" men have only to meet by chance, when a word, a gesture, misinterpreted, results in bloodshed, perhaps death. Exactly so with nations. The causes of wars, both between nations and men, are generally of trifling moment. So much depends upon their attitude to each other, friendly or unfriendly. If the former, no dispute but can be peacefully settled; if unfriendly, no trifle but can create war; the disposition is all. Hence the folly and danger of nations arming against each other, which must always arouse mutual suspicion, fatal to friendly relations.

Armaments and true friendship are incompatible. Even nations in close alliance against other nations must always feel the alliance may give place to other and perhaps hostile alliances. Thus suspicion inevitably follows armaments as shadows follow substance. There is no escape, and suspicion is fatal.

Second: "Our armaments are intended only for our own protection and are no menace to other nations; they make for peace."

Answer: So say all the armed nations, and it is true that every nation regards and proclaims its own armaments as instruments of peace only, because these are meant to protect her from the existing armaments of other nations; but just as naturally every nation regards every other nation's armaments as clearly instruments of war, and not of peace, because these may attack her. Thus each nation suspects all the others, and only a spark is needed to set fire to the mass of inflammable material. It is impossible that formidable armaments of one nation should not create alarm among other nations; although all nations may protest that they do not intend to attack, yet they may.

Thus armaments, either personal or national, on land or on sea, so far from preserving peace, inevitably become in time one of the chief, if not the greatest of all, causes of war, since they sow the deadly seeds of mutual suspicion.

The gigantic armaments of our own day have greatly added to this danger, which future additions now under way must inevitably increase. Clearly, increasing armaments is no remedy, since they multiply the dangers of war.

Third: "Armaments are the cheap defense of nations."

Answer: Let us see. Last year Britain spent upon army and navy in round numbers £70,000,000 (\$345,000,000); Germany, £48,000,000 (\$233,000,000); Amer-

ica, £97,000,000 (\$470,000,000), £32,000,000 (\$160,000,000) of this upon war pensions. This expenditure was before the day of Dreadnaughts, now costing about \$12,000,000 each, say £2,250,000. The naval expenditure of nations and hence the dangers of war are to be much greater in the future, and the end thereof, under present ominous conditions, no one can foretell. One point, however, is clear. Neither men nor money will be wanting with any first-class power involved, since for no cause, unfortunately, can the populace of every land be so easily and heavily burdened as for that of foreign war, in which all men are so prone to believe their country in the right.

The remedy: Recently delegates of the eight naval powers, Germany, France, Italy, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Japan, Britain, America, sitting in London, unanimously agreed to establish an International Supreme Court, to deliver final judgment upon all cases of marine captures, each nation appointing one judge. To such of the smaller nations as apply for admission, seven judges are to be accorded in turn, so that the great maritime nations combined have always a majority, which is common sense.

These same eight powers have only to meet again and decree that hereafter disputes between civilized nations shall be settled in like manner (or by arbitration), and war becomes a thing of the past.

The Clark University Conference on the Far East.

BY JAMES L. TRYON.

The twentieth anniversary of Clark University was celebrated by a new departure in university life. This institution, instead of dwelling upon the glories of its recent past, held conferences in chemistry and history, to which it invited the people of Worcester, representatives of the press, and distinguished guests, to hear experts discuss some of the most pressing problems of the time. The conferences were in general charge of the president, Dr. G. Stanley Hall. He was assisted by members of the faculty, who entered fully into his spirit in organizing the program. Prof. George H. Blakeslee chose as the topic for the history department, "The Far East." Professor Blakeslee is personally familiar with this quarter of the world. By wide travel or correspondence he has made the acquaintance of educators, missionaries and government officials who live or have lived on the spot, and who accepted his invitation to speak at the conference.

The occasion was a splendid interpretation of the intellectual tastes of the American people. As one of the speakers remarked, "The American colleges must study vital questions, and not be contented with the old humanities, if they expect to keep their hold on the people." Clark University offered in the study of world politics a kind of culture for which the American mind is every